RE: NWOD In-Canal Stabilization Test Section Work Plan for Agency Review - Today if possible

Paul Fuglevand to: Hernandez.Kathryn

10/22/2012 10:32 AM

From: "Paul Fuglevand" <pfuglevand@dofnw.com>

To:

Cc: "Bill Rees" <bre>
cc: "Bill Rees" <bre>
cpalmer@utah.gov>, "Elizabeth Palmer" <epalmer@utah.gov>

Please respond to <pfuglevand@dofnw.com>

Just a guick email on landfill footprint calculations:

Assumed added tons of sediment to add cement at 5% by weight

<![if !supportLists]>•<![endif]>Segment 2B 25,000 tons Excavation, add cement adds 1,250 tons

<![if !supportLists]>•<![endif]>Segment 3 25,000 tons Excavation, add cement adds 1,250 tons

<![if !supportLists]>• <![endif]>Total added landfill with cement, 2,500 tons

Cement in-canal stabilization eliminates 2 or 3 SPAs. It is too far to truck all the way back to SPA 1 for segments 2B and 3. Likely will have a SPA for Segment 2B, and two SPAs for Segment 3, one on each side of the Jordon River. After use each SPA will require demolition. At 1 acre each, and assuming 1' of material to remove and dispose of, each SPA will result in about 2,000 tons of added disposal. Two SPAs would add **4,000 tons** of disposal. Three SPAs would result in up to 6,000 tons of disposal.

So doing in-canal stabilization has the potential to result in a net decrease of tons to landfill of 1,500 tons (4,000 - 2,500) to 3,500 tons (6,000 - 2,500) tons.

Paul Fuglevand

Dalton, Olmsted & Fuglevand, Inc.

10827 NE 68th Street, Suite B

Kirkland, WA 98033

Phone 425 827-4588

Cell 206 660-3079

This electronic message transmission contains information that may be confidential and/or privileged work product prepared in anticipation of litigation. The information is intended for the use of the individual or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, please be aware that any disclosure, copying distribution or use of the contents of this information is prohibited. If you have received this electronic transmission in error, please notify me by telephone at (425) 827-4588, or by electronic mail, pfuglevand@dofnw.com

From: Hernandez.Kathryn@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Hernandez.Kathryn@epamail.epa.gov]

Sent: Monday, October 22, 2012 8:13 AM

To: pfuglevand@dofnw.com **Cc:** Bill Rees; Elizabeth Palmer

Subject: Re: NWOD In-Canal Stabilization Test Section Work Plan for Agency Review - Today if possible

Based on this document (the latest version did not come to my epa email), the summary is not adequate. The criteria I want reviewed are 1) Assessment of the volume/weight of material disposed of amended with Portland Cement vs zapzorb. Although you discuss the SPAs that will not have to be built, there is no overall discussion of the total disposal volume/weight expectation based on the different methods. Can the same

facility be used? lined/unlined?, difference in transport (my guess is this material will be significantly heavier)? etc. Will there be more truck trips offsite? Additionally, please clarify if there will be any residual from the Portland Cement left at the site? Upland or instream? What about its effect on the landfill (biodegradeable) etc? When zapzorb vs PC, what is the long term footprint at the disposal facility?

As I had mentioned earlier I would like a clear summary of the total impacts (environmental footprint) of using both of these options.

Kathryn Hernandez USEPA, Region VIII (8EPR-SR) 1595 Wynkoop Street Denver, CO 80202 (303) 312-6101(office) (720) 352-7497(cell)

"Paul Fuglevand" ---10/19/2012 08:35:26 AM---Kathy, Liz, Bill

From: "Paul Fuglevand" <pfuglevand@dofnw.com>

To: "Bill Rees" < brees@utah.gov>, "'Elizabeth Palmer" < epalmer@utah.gov>, Kathryn Hernandez/R8/USEPA/US@EPA

Cc: "Laura Briefer" < laura.briefer@slcgov.com>, "Pak, Eugene" < EugenePak@chevron.com>, "Rob Webb" < rwebb@dofnw.com>, "Skance,
John" < John.Skance@bp.com>, "Galen Williams" < gwilliams@earthfax.com>, "Richard B. White" < rbwhite@earthfax.com>, "Scott Murphy" < smurphy@earthfax.com>, "Eve Barron" < EveBarron@chevron.com>, "Kevin Murray" < kmurray@chapman.com>, "Nicole Squires" < squires@chapman.com>, < Sheila.Dcruz@bp.com>, "Cooper, Dave" < dcooper@dofnw.com>, "Dan Pickering" < dpickering@dofnw.com>, "Suzanne Kaminski" < skaminski@dofnw.com>, "Teal Dreher" < tdreher@dofnw.com>

Date: 10/19/2012 08:35 AM

Subject: NWOD In-Canal Stabilization Test Section Work Plan for Agency Review - Today if possible

Kathy, Liz, Bill

Attached is a NWOD In-Canal Stabilization Test Section Work Plan for your review, today if possible. We expect to complete removal of the sediment from Section 2A of the canal by the end of next week, so we would like to begin preparing for a test section on Monday to make it happen.

Feel free to call me with any questions or comments. We would like to give the contractor notice for the test section by end of day Monday if at all possible.

Thank you for your consideration of the in-canal stabilization work plan.

Paul Fuglevand
Dalton, Olmsted & Fuglevand, Inc.
10827 NE 68th Street, Suite B
Kirkland, WA 98033
Phone 425 827-4588
Cell 206 660-3079

This electronic message transmission contains information that may be confidential and/or privileged work product prepared in anticipation of litigation. The information is intended for the use of the individual or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, please be aware that any disclosure, copying distribution or use of the contents of this information is prohibited. If you have received this electronic transmission in error, please notify me by telephone at (425) 827-4588, or by electronic mail, pfuglevand@dofnw.com

[attachment "NWOD In-Canal Stabilization Test Section Work Plan 2012-10-19.pdf" deleted by Kathryn Hernandez/R8/USEPA/US]